arXiv:math/0010169v2 [math.CA] 5 Nov 2000

The spectral set conjecture and multiplicative properties of roots of polynomials

I. Łaba [*]
Department of Mathematics
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada V6T 1Z2
ilaba@math.ubc.ca

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Fuglede's conjecture [2] states that a set $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ tiles $\mathbf{R}$ by translations if and only if $L^2(\Omega)$ has an orthogonal basis of exponentials. We obtain new partial results supporting the conjecture in dimension 1.

1 The results

A Borel set $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ of positive measure is said to *tile* $\mathbf{R}^n$ *by translations* if there is a discrete set $T \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ such that, up to sets of measure 0, the sets $\Omega + t,\ t \in T$, are disjoint and $\bigcup_{t\in T}(\Omega + t) = \mathbf{R}^n$. We will refer to T as the *translation set*, and write $\mathbf{R} = \Omega \oplus T$. We also say that $\Lambda = \{\lambda_k\}_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a *spectrum* for Ω if:

$$\{e^{2\pi i\lambda_k\cdot x}\}_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} \text{ is an orthogonal basis for } L^2(\Omega). \tag{1.1}$$

A *spectral set* is a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ such that (1.1) holds for some Λ.

The following conjecture is due to Fuglede [2].

Conjecture 1.1 (The spectral set conjecture [2].) *A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a spectral set if and only if it tiles $\mathbf{R}^n$ by translations.*

Conjecture 1.1 has a functional-analytic origin: it was motivated by a question of I. Segal concerning the "extension property", *i.e.,* the existence of commuting self-adjoint extensions of the operators $-i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, defined on $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, to a dense subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$. It turns out that any spectral set Ω has the extension property; moreover, if Ω is assumed to be connected, it must be a spectral set in order for the extension property to hold ([2], [7], [21]).

---

[*] Supported in part by NSERC

Fuglede proved in [2] that the conjecture is true if either Λ or T is a group. Subsequent attempts to resolve the general case have revealed connections to functional analysis, representation theory, combinatorics, commutative algebra, and Fourier analysis, among others. Fuglede's conjecture has also led to many other questions of independent interest concerning the relations between the tiling and spectral properties of sets, some of which have now been investigated in detail. (See *e.g.,* [3], [4], [6], [8], [11], [9], [12], [13], [16], [17], [18], [19].)

For convex domains $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, the problem is now understood to be related to the geometry of the set $\{\xi : \ \hat{\chi}_\Omega(\xi) = 0\}$ ([12], [3], [4]), and the 2-dimensional convex case appears to be resolved [5]. The general case is much more complicated, even in dimension 1, and is still nowhere near resolution.

The purpose of this paper is to relate the spectral set conjecture for domains $\Omega = A + [0,1] \subset \mathbf{R}$ to purely algebraic questions concerning the multiplicative properties of roots of certain types of polynomials, and to provide partial answers to these questions.

We briefly summarize some of the previous work relevant to the subject. Lagarias and Wang [18] proved that if $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}$ is a bounded domain and $\Omega \oplus T = \mathbf{R}$, then T is rational and periodic. The question of when a given periodic set Λ is a spectrum for a given tile set T was discussed in [19], [22]. In particular, it is proved in [19] (Theorem 1.2) that if $\Omega \oplus T = \mathbf{R}$, $T = B + N\mathbf{Z}$, $B \subset \mathbf{Z}$, and the cyclic group $\mathbf{Z}_N$ has the *strong Tijdeman property*, then Ω is a spectral set; however, there are examples of $\mathbf{Z}_N$ which do not have the Tijdeman property, see [24], [17]. Our Corollary 1.6 uses the recent results of [1] to improve on Theorem 1.3 of [19].

It is not known whether a spectrum Λ of a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}$ must always be rational and periodic. For domains of the form $\Omega = A + [0,1)$, the results of [10] (see Proposition 1.3 below) imply that Λ must indeed be periodic. The rationality of Λ seems to be a more difficult question: Theorem 1.9 below is a modest partial result in this direction.

Several special cases of the conjecture have been investigated in more detail, see *e.g.,* [15], [23]. Note that the articles [19], [23] considered also the related question of the existence of a *universal spectrum*, *i.e.,* a common spectrum for all domains Ω which tile $\mathbf{R}^n$ by the same set of translations T. This question will not be addressed in the present paper.

Let

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{j=0}^{N-1} [a_j, a_j + 1) \subset \mathbf{R}, \ \Lambda = \{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \subset \mathbf{R}. \tag{1.2}$$

We will say that Λ is a spectrum for Ω if (1.1) holds. Clearly, we may assume that $a_0 = 0$, $\lambda_0 = 0$.

Definition 1.2 *Let $A(x)$ be a polynomial of the form $A(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x^{a_k}$, where a_k are distinct non-negative integers. We will say that $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{N-1}\} \subset (0,1)$ is a* spectrum *for $A(x)$ if the θ_j are all distinct and:*

$$A(\epsilon_{ij}) = 0 \text{ for all } 0 \le i, j \le N-1, \ i \ne j, \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$\epsilon_{ij} = e^{2\pi i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}, \ \theta_0 = 1. \tag{1.4}$$

The reason for this terminology is the following result, due to Jorgensen and Pedersen [10] (see also [22]).

Proposition 1.3 *(Jorgensen - Pedersen [10]) Let* Ω *and* Λ *be as in (1.2),* $0 \in \Lambda$*. Then* Λ *is a spectrum for* Ω *if and only if all of the following are satisfied:*

(i) $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{N-1} \in \mathbf{Z}$*;*

(ii) the polynomial $A(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x^{a_k}$ *has a spectrum* $\{\theta_j : \ j = 1, \ldots, N-1\} \subset (0,1)$*;*

(iii) $\Lambda = \bigcup_{j=0}^{N-1} (\theta_j + \mathbf{Z})$*, where* $\theta_0 = 0$ *and* θ_j*,* $j = 1, \ldots, N-1$*, are as in (ii).*

This result was stated in [10] in terms of Hadamard matrices: it is easy to see that the condition (ii) above is satisfied if and only if the columns of the matrix $(e^{2\pi i a_j \theta_k})_{j,k}$ are mutually orthogonal, which was the condition given in [10]. Our reformulation of it in terms of polynomials was motivated by the recent work of Coven and Meyerowitz [1], who related the tiling properties of a set $A \subset \mathbf{Z}$ to the algebraic properties of the corresponding polynomial $A(x) = \sum_{a \in A} x^a$. (Note that such polynomials were also used in [23].) Clearly, $A \subset \mathbf{Z}$ tiles $\mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $A + [0,1)$ tiles $\mathbf{R}$, hence the relevance of this work to the problem under consideration.

The main result of [1] is as follows. Recall that, for $s \in \mathbf{Z}$, the s-th cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_s(x)$ is defined inductively by $x^s - 1 = \prod_{k|s} \Phi_s(x)$; equivalently, $\Phi_s(x) = \prod(x - \epsilon_i)$, where ϵ_i are the s-th primitive roots of 1. Define $A(x)$ as above, and let S_A be the set of prime powers s such that $\Phi_s(x)$ divides $A(x)$. Consider the following conditions on $A(x)$:

(T1) $A(1) = \prod_{s \in S_A} \Phi_s(1)$;

(T2) If $s_1, \ldots, s_k \in S_A$ are powers of different primes, then $\Phi_{s_1 \ldots s_k}(x)$ divides $A(x)$.

Theorem 1.4 *(Coven - Meyerowitz [1])*

(i) if (T1), (T2) hold, then A *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$ *by translations;*

(ii) if A *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$ *by translations, then (T1) holds;*

(iii) if A *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$ *by translations and* $N = \#A$ *has at most two prime factors, then (T2) holds.*

It is not known whether (T2) is satisfied for all sets A which tile $\mathbf{Z}$ by translations. It does hold in all cases known to the author, and, in particular, it holds for the sets constructed by Szabó [24] which were used to disprove Tijdeman's conjecture.

Our first result is that (T1), (T2) also guarantee the existence of a spectrum, and that a weak partial converse holds. Here and in the sequel, A is a subset of $\mathbf{Z}$ with $0 \in A$, $N = \#A \geq 2$, $A(x)$, S_A are defined as above, and $\Omega = A + [0,1)$.

Theorem 1.5 *(i) If* $A(x)$ *satisfies (T1), (T2), it has a spectrum.*

(ii) If $A(x)$ *has a spectrum* $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{N-1}\} \subset p^{-\alpha}\mathbf{Z}$*, where* p *is a prime,* $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}$*, then* N *is a power of* p*, and (T1) holds.*

Combining Theorem 1.5 with Proposition 1.3 and Theorem 1.4, we obtain the following immediate corollary, which improves on Theorem 1.3 of [19]. (Note that if $N = p^\alpha$ is a prime power, then (T2) automatically holds.)

Corollary 1.6 *(i) If* Ω *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$ *and* N *has at most 2 prime factors, then* Ω *is a spectral set.*

(ii) If Ω *is a spectral set with a spectrum* $\Lambda \subset s^{-1}\mathbf{Z}$*, where* $s = p^\alpha$ *is a prime power, then* Ω *tiles* $\mathbf{R}$ *by translations.*

An easy application of Corollary 1.6 yields the following.

Corollary 1.7 *Assume that* $N = 3$, *then* Ω *is a spectral set if and only if it tiles* $\mathbf{R}$ *by translations.*

Note, however, that a spectrum need not always satisfy $\Lambda \subset p^{-\alpha}\mathbf{Z}$, even if N is a power of p. For instance, $\Omega = \{0, 1, 6, 7\} + [0, 1)$ has a spectrum $\Lambda = \{0, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{7}{12}\} + \mathbf{Z}$.

In light of the next theorem, the case when the degree of $A(x)$ is relatively small (equivalently, the set Ω is contained in a relatively short interval) seems to be a natural starting point for further investigation. The author expects that a more general result should hold: if $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ "almost fills up" a convex set, and if it is a spectral set or tiles $\mathbf{R}^n$ by translations, it must be a fundamental domain for a group.

Theorem 1.8 *Suppose that* $A \subset [0, M - 1]$, $M < 3N/2$, *and let* $\Omega = A + [0, 1)$. *Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) A *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$ *by translations;*

(ii) Ω *is a spectral set;*

(iii) Ω *is a fundamental domain for the group* $N\mathbf{Z}$, *i.e.,* $A = \{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}(\mathrm{mod}\, N)$;

(iv) $N\mathbf{Z} \oplus A = \mathbf{Z}$, *i.e.,* $N\mathbf{Z} \oplus \Omega = \mathbf{R}$;

(v) $\Lambda = N^{-1}\mathbf{Z}$ *is a spectrum for* Ω.

The equivalence (iii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iv) $\Leftrightarrow$ (v) (for an arbitrary domain Ω) is Fuglede's theorem [2], and the implications (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i), (v) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) are trivial. Our new result is that the implications (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) and (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) hold for A as in the theorem. Note that the set $\Omega_n = [0, n] \cup [2n, 3n]$ tiles $\mathbf{R}$ and is a spectral set, but is not a fundamental domain for any group; this shows that the inequality $M < 3N/2$ cannot be weakened.

We do not know whether a spectrum must always be rational, or whether any spectral set must have a rational spectrum. However, we have the following partial result.

Theorem 1.9 *Suppose that* $\Omega = A + [0, 1)$ *has a spectrum* Λ, *and that* $\Omega \subset [0, M]$ *for some* $M < 5N/2$. *Then* $\Lambda \subset \mathbf{Q}$.

If the polynomial $A(x)$ is assumed to be irreducible, a stronger result holds.

Proposition 1.10 *(i) Suppose that* A *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$ *and that* $A(x)$ *is irreducible. Then* N *is prime,* $A(x) = \Phi_{N^\alpha}(x)$ *for some* $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}$, $A = \{0, \alpha, 2\alpha, \dots, (N-1)\alpha\}$, *and* $\{k/N^\alpha : k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1\}$ *is a spectrum for* $A(x)$.

(ii) Suppose that $A(x)$ *is irreducible, has a spectrum, and that* $deg(A(x)) < \frac{5N}{2}$. *Then the conclusions of (i) hold, and, in particular,* A *tiles* $\mathbf{Z}$.

If m, n are integers, we will use (m, n) to denote the greatest common divisor of m, n. The cardinality of a finite set A is denoted by $\#A$.

The author is grateful to Peter Borwein, David Boyd, and Richard Froese for helpful conversations.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We first prove (i). Assume that (T1), (T2) hold, and define S_A as in the introduction. Consider the set B of all numbers of the form:

$$\sum_{s\in S_A} \frac{k_s}{s},$$

where $k_s \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ if $s = p^\alpha \in S_A$ and p is prime. We claim that B is a spectrum for A.

Let $N = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_m^{\alpha_m}$, where p_i are distinct primes. We have:

$$\Phi_s(1) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s = 1, \\ p & \text{if } s = p^\alpha \text{ is a prime power,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

(see [1], Lemma 1.1). Thus (T1) implies that for each i there are exactly α_i powers of p_i in S_A. It follows that the cardinality of B is $p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_m^{\alpha_m} = N$.

It remains to check that

$$A(e^{2\pi i(b-b')}) = 0 \text{ for all } b, b' \in B. \tag{2.2}$$

Fix $b, b' \in B$. Then $b - b'$ is a number of the form $\sum_{s\in S_A} \frac{k_s}{s}$, where $k_s \in \{-p_i+1, -p_i+2, \dots, p_i-1\}$ if s is a power of p_i. We rewrite this as $b - b' = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i$, where $b_i = 0$ or

$$b_i = \sum_{\beta : p_i^\beta \in S_A} \frac{k_{p_i^\beta}}{p_i^\beta},$$

and $k_{p_i^\beta} \in \{-p_i+1, \dots, p_i-1\}$. If $b_i \neq 0$, we may further write:

$$b_i = \frac{k_i}{p_i^{\beta_i}},$$

where β_i is the largest exponent such that $p_i^{\beta_i} \in S_A$, $k_{p_i^{\beta_i}} \neq 0$, and $k_i \neq 0$ is an integer not divisible by p_i. By Lemma 2.1 below,

$$\Phi_s(e^{2\pi i(b-b')}) = 0 \text{ for } s = \prod_{i : b_i \neq 0} p_i^{\beta_i}.$$

This immediately implies (2.2): since $p_i^{\beta_i} \in S_A$ for each i, by (T2) $\Phi_s(x)$ divides $A(x)$, hence $e^{2\pi i(b-b')}$ is also a root of $A(x)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let* $b = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{k_i}{s_i}$, *where* $(k_i, s_i) = 1$ *for all* i *and* $(s_i, s_j) = 1$ *for all* $i \neq j$. *Then* $\Phi_s(e^{2\pi i b}) = 0$ *for* $s = s_1 \dots s_n$.

Proof. The roots of $\Phi_s(x)$ are the primitive s-th roots of unity, *i.e.,* the numbers $e^{2\pi i k/s}$ for $(k, s) = 1$. We write:

$$b = \frac{k}{s},\ s = s_1 \dots s_n,\ k = k_1 \frac{s}{s_1} + \dots + k_n \frac{s}{s_n}.$$

It suffices to check that k, s are relatively prime. Suppose therefore that there is a prime p such that $p|k$ and $p|s$. Then p divides one of the s_i, say s_1. Since s_1 divides s/s_i for all $i \neq 1$, it follows that p divides $k_2\frac{s}{s_2} + \ldots + k_n\frac{s}{s_n}$. Since we also assumed that $p|k$, we must have $p|k_1\frac{s}{s_1}$, hence p divides either k_1 or s/s_1. This, however, contradicts the assumptions of the lemma. Indeed, p cannot divide k_1, since $(k_1, s_1) = 1$. But we also have $(s_1, s_i) = 1$ for $i \neq 1$, hence $(s_1, s/s_1) = 1$ and p cannot divide s/s_1. ■

Next, we turn to part (ii) of the theorem. Suppose that $\{\theta_j\} \subset s^{-1}\mathbf{Z}$ is a spectrum for $A(x)$, where $s = p^\alpha$, p is prime. Define $\theta_0 = 0$, $\theta_{ij} = \theta_i - \theta_j$, then $e^{2\pi i\theta_{ij}}$ is a root of $(x-1)A(x)$ for each $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$. We may write for all $i \neq j$:

$$\theta_{ij} = \frac{k_{ij}}{p^{\alpha_{ij}}},\ \alpha_{ij} \geq 1,\ (p, k_{ij}) = 1. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $r_1 < \ldots < r_m$ be the distinct values of α_{ij} in (2.3). Since $\Phi_{p^{\alpha_{ij}}}(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of $e^{2\pi i\theta_{ij}}$, we must have

$$\Phi_{p^{r_1}}(x)\ldots\Phi_{p^{r_m}}(x) \mid A(x).$$

From this and (2.1) it follows that

$$p^m = \Phi_{p^{r_1}}(1)\ldots\Phi_{p^{r_m}}(1) \mid A(1) = N,$$

and in particular $N \geq p^m$. Thus (ii) will follow if we prove that $N \leq p^m$. To do this, it suffices to verify that the polynomial

$$F_{0,r_1,\ldots,r_m}(x) = (x-1)\Phi_{p^{r_1}}(x)\ldots\Phi_{p^{r_m}}(x)$$

has at most p^m roots ϵ_i such that

$$F_{0,r_1,\ldots,r_m}(\epsilon_i/\epsilon_j) = 0 \text{ for all } i, j. \tag{2.4}$$

The proof is by induction on m. If $m = 1$, all roots of $F_{0,r_1}(x) = (x-1)\Phi_{p^{r_1}}(x)$ are of the form $e^{2\pi ik/p^{r_1}}$, $k \in \mathbf{Z}$. If k, k' belong to the same residue class (mod p^{r_1-1}), then $k - k'$ and p^{r_1} are not relatively prime, hence either the corresponding roots $e^{2\pi ik/p^{r_1}}$ and $e^{2\pi ik'/p^{r_1}}$ are equal, or else $e^{2\pi i(k-k')/p^{r_1}}$ is not a root of $F_{0,r_1}(x)$. Since there are only p distinct residue classes (mod p), the claim follows for $m = 1$.

Assume now that the claim is true with m replaced by $m-1$. Let $\epsilon_j = e^{2\pi ik_j/r_m}$ be roots of $F_{0,r_1,\ldots,r_m}(x)$ satisfying (2.4). We divide them into p equivalence classes $\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_{p-1}$:

$$\epsilon_j = e^{2\pi ik_j/r^m} \in \Theta_l \Leftrightarrow k_j = l (\operatorname{mod} p^{r_m-1}).$$

By the same argument as above, if ϵ_i, ϵ_j belong to the same Θ_l, ϵ_i/ϵ_j cannot be a root of $\Phi_{p^{r_m}}(x)$, and must therefore be a root of $F_{0,r_1,\ldots,r_{m-1}}(x) = (x-1)\Phi_{p^{r_1}}(x)\ldots\Phi_{p^{r_{m-1}}}(x)$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\#\Theta_l \leq p^{m-1}$. Since the number of Θ_l's is p, the claim follows. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.8

Let $A = \{a_0 = 0, a_1, \dots, a_{N-1}\} \subset (\mathbf{Z} \cap [0, M-1])$, $M < 3N/2$, and let $\Omega = A + [0,1)$. We may assume that $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_{N-1}$, $M = a_{N-1} + 1$. We must prove that each of the conditions (i), (ii) of Theorem 1.8 implies that Ω is a fundamental domain for $N\mathbf{Z}$, *i.e.,* $A = \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\} (\operatorname{mod} N)$.

Proof of (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). Assume that A tiles $\mathbf{Z}$ by translations, *i.e.,* there is a set $B = \{b_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} \subset \mathbf{Z}$ such that $A \oplus B = \mathbf{Z}$ (and, consequently, $\Omega \oplus B = \mathbf{R}$). We may assume that $b_i < b_{i+1}$ for all i. Define:

$$c_i = b_i + M, \ \Omega_i = \Omega + b_i, \ I_i = [b_i, c_i).$$

The interval $[b_i, c_{i+2})$ contains three disjoint translates of Ω $(\Omega_i, \Omega_{i+1}, \Omega_{i+2})$, hence we must have $c_{i+2} - b_i \geq 3N$. Using also that $M < 3N/2$, we see that:

$$b_{i+2} - c_i = (c_{i+2} - M) - (b_i + M) \geq 3N - M > 0.$$

We also have the trivial inequality $c_i \geq b_{i+1}$ (if it failed, $\Omega \oplus B$ would have "gaps" (c_i, b_{i+1}).) Hence each I_i may overlap only with its immediate predecessor I_{i-1} and successor I_{i+1}:

$$\dots < b_i \leq c_{i-1} < b_{i+1} \leq c_i < b_{i+2} \leq \dots. \tag{3.1}$$

For $m > 0$, define:

$$S_1(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (b_{i+1} - c_{i-1}), \ S_2(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (c_i - b_{i+1}).$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\int_{b_1}^{c_m} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{\Omega_i} &= S_1(m) + S_2(m) + O(1), \\ \textstyle\int_{b_1}^{c_m} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{I_i} &= S_1(m) + 2S_2(m) + O(1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where we used that $\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{\Omega_i} \equiv 1$ and that, by (3.1),

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{I_i}(x) = \begin{cases} 2, & x \in (b_{i+1}, c_i), \\ 1, & x \in (c_{i-1}, b_{i+1}). \end{cases}$$

(Here and in the sequel, $O(1)$ denotes a quantity which, for any fixed N and M, is bounded uniformly in m as $m \to \infty$.) On the other hand, counting the Ω_i's contained in $[b_1, c_m]$ and the I_i's having non-empty intersection with it, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\int_{b_1}^{c_m} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{\Omega_i} &\geq mN + O(1), \\ \textstyle\int_{b_1}^{c_m} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{I_i} &\leq mM + O(1) \leq \alpha mN + O(1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for some $\alpha < 3/2$ independent of m. From (3.2) and (3.3) we have:

$$S_1(m) + 2S_2(m) \leq \alpha mN + O(1),$$

$$S_1(m) + S_2(m) \geq mN + O(1),$$

which yields that:

$$S_2(m) \leq (\alpha - 1)mN + O(1),\ S_1(m) \geq (1-\alpha)mN + O(1).$$

In particular, $\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{S_1(m)}{m} \geq (1-\alpha)N > N/2$, hence we must have $b_{i+1} - c_{i-1} > N/2$ for some i. But, by (3.1), $(c_{i-1}, b_{i+1}) \subset \Omega_i \setminus \bigcup_{j\neq i} \Omega_j$, hence Ω contains at least one "uninterrupted" interval of length $> N/2$.

Assume therefore that $[m,n] \subset \Omega$, $n-m > N/2$, and that $[m,n]$ is maximal: $m-\frac{1}{2}, n+\frac{1}{2} \notin \Omega$. Let $m_i = m + b_i$, $n_i = n + b_i$. By (3.1),

$$([m_i - 1, m_i) \cup [n_i, n_i + 1)) \subset (I_{i-1} \cup I_{i+1}).$$

Suppose that $[m'-1, m') \subset I_{i+1}$ for some $b_i \leq m' \leq m_i$. Since $b_{i+1} > 1$, I_{i+1} contains at least one unit interval to the right of I_i, and, in particular, $[m_i, n_i) \subset I_{i+1}$. But $[m_i, n_i) \cap \Omega_{i+1} = 0$. Thus $|I_{i+1}| \geq |\Omega_{i+1}| + (n_i - m_i) > 3N/2$, which contradicts the assumption that $M = |I_{i+1}| < 3N/2$. We must therefore have $[m'-1, m') \subset I_{i-1}$. Similarly, $[n', n'+1) \subset I_{i+1}$ for all $n_i \leq n' \leq c_i - 1$. It follows that:

$$c_{i-1} = m_i,\ b_{i+1} = n_i,\ [b_{i+1}, c_i) \subset \Omega_i \cup \Omega_{i+1}.$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} & b_{i+1} - c_{i-1} = n_i - m_i = n - m, \\ & c_i - b_{i+1} = |\Omega_i \cap [n_i, c_i)| + |\Omega_{i+1} \cap [b_{i+1}, c_i)| = |\Omega \cap [n, M)| + |\Omega \cap [0, m)| \\ & = |\Omega \setminus [m, n)| = N - (n - m), \end{aligned}$$

so that:

$$c_i - c_{i-1} = (c_i - b_{i+1}) + (b_{i+1} - c_{i-1}) = (N - (n-m)) + (n-m) = N.$$

This proves (iv).

Proof of (ii) ⇒ (v). Suppose that Ω is a spectral set. By Proposition 1.3, $A(x) = \sum x^{a_i}$ has a spectrum $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{N-1}\} \subset (0,1)$. We will also denote $\theta_0 = 0$. Then:

$$A(\epsilon_{ij}) = 0,\ i \neq j,$$

where $\epsilon_{ij} = e^{2\pi i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}$.

We will first prove that

$$\forall i, j, k, l\ \exists m, i', l' \text{ such that } \epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon_{i'm},\ \epsilon_{kl} = \epsilon_{ml'}. \tag{3.4}$$

This will imply that $G = \{\epsilon_{ij} :\ i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$ is a group. Indeed, since G is finite and contains $1 = \epsilon_{ii}$, it suffices to prove that G is closed under multiplication. But if (3.4) holds, then for any $\epsilon_{ij}, \epsilon_{kl} \in G$ we have

$$\epsilon_{ij}\epsilon_{kl} = \epsilon_{i'm}\epsilon_{ml'} = \epsilon_{i'l'} \in G.$$

The verification of (3.4) is as follows. Observe that:

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon_{i'm} \Leftrightarrow \epsilon_{ii'} = \epsilon_{jm},\ \epsilon_{kl} = \epsilon_{ml'} \Leftrightarrow \epsilon_{ll'} = \epsilon_{km},$$

hence it suffices to prove that:

$$\forall i, j, k, l\ \exists m, i', l' \text{ such that } \epsilon_{ii'} = \epsilon_{jm},\ \epsilon_{ll'} = \epsilon_{km}. \tag{3.5}$$

For each pair (i, j) define:

$$E_{ij} = \{m \in \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\} :\ \epsilon_{jm} = \epsilon_{ii'} \text{ for some } i'\},$$

then (3.5) is equivalent to:

$$E_{ij} \cap E_{kl} \neq \emptyset. \tag{3.6}$$

Since $M < 3N/2$, we have $\deg(A(x)) < \frac{3N}{2} - 1$. We have $\epsilon_{ii} = 1$, and $A(\epsilon_{ij}) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, hence the number of the possible values that ϵ_{ij} may take is bounded by

$$\deg(A(x)) + 1 < \frac{3N}{2}.$$

On the other hand, since θ_i are distinct, so are $\epsilon_{i0}, \epsilon_{i1}, \ldots, \epsilon_{i,N-1}$ for any i. Hence for any i, j, the number of values which occur both in $\{\epsilon_{i0}, \epsilon_{i1}, \ldots, \epsilon_{i,N-1}\}$ and in $\{\epsilon_{j0}, \epsilon_{j1}, \ldots, \epsilon_{j,N-1}\}$ is $> N + N - \frac{3N}{2} = N/2$. But this means that

$$\#E_{ij} > N/2.$$

Thus E_{ij}, E_{kl} are two subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$ of cardinality $> N/2$, whereupon (3.6) follows.

We have proved that G is a group, hence G must be the set of all n-th roots of 1 for some $n \in \mathbf{Z}$. But $A(\epsilon_{ij}) = 0$ for all $\epsilon_{ij} \in G$, hence the polynomial $P_n(x) = 1 + x + \ldots + x^{n-1}$ divides $A(x)$, and, in particular, $n = P_n(1) | A(1) = N$. On the other hand, since ϵ_i are all distinct, $n = \#G \geq N$. Hence $n = N$, and the ϵ_i are N-th roots of 1, *i.e.,* $\Lambda = \frac{1}{N}\mathbf{Z}$. ∎

Observe that the proof of the implication (ii) ⇒ (v) did not actually use that the degree of $A(x)$ was $< \frac{3N}{2} - 1$, but only that $A(x)$ has $< \frac{3N}{2} - 1$ roots of modulus 1. Hence we have also proved the following result, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.9.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that $A(x)$ has a spectrum, and that $\#\{x :\ A(x) = 0, |x| = 1\} < \frac{3N}{2} - 1$. Then the conclusions (iii)–(v) of Theorem 1.8 hold.*

4 Proof of Theorem 1.9.

Suppose that Ω has a spectrum Λ, then $A(x)$ has a spectrum $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{n-1}\}$ as in Proposition 1.3. It suffices to prove that if $\Omega \subset [0, M]$, and if θ_1 is irrational, then

$$M \geq \frac{5N}{2}. \tag{4.1}$$

Suppose that $\theta_1 \notin \mathbf{Q}$. By Lemma 3.1, $A(x)$ has at least $\frac{3N}{2} - 1$ roots of modulus 1. By Lemma 4.1 below, $A(x)$ has at least $N-1$ roots off the unit circle. Hence

$$M \geq \deg(A(x)) + 1 \geq (N-1) + (\frac{3N}{2} - 1) + 1 = \frac{5N}{2} - 1. \tag{4.2}$$

We now improve this to (4.1) by a simple scaling argument. Consider the set $k\Omega = kA = [0, k)$, where $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Clearly, if Ω has a spectrum $\Lambda \not\subset \mathbf{Q}$, then $k\Omega$ has a spectrum $k^{-1}\Lambda \not\subset \mathbf{Q}$. But applying (4.2) to $k\Omega$, we obtain that

$$kM \geq \frac{5kN}{2} - 1.$$

Dividing both sides by k and taking the limit $k \to \infty$, we obtain (4.1). ■

Lemma 4.1 *Suppose that $A(x)$ has a spectrum $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{N-1}$, and that $\theta_1 \notin \mathbf{Q}$. Then $A(x)$ has at least $N-1$ roots of modulus $\neq 1$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon_j = e^{2\pi i\theta_j}$, $\epsilon_0 = 1$, $\epsilon_{jk} := \epsilon_j/\epsilon_k$; then $\epsilon_j, j \neq 0$, and $\epsilon_{jk}, j \neq k$, are roots of $A(x)$. Since ϵ_1 is not a root of 1, by Kronecker's theorem [14] the minimal polynomial $A_1(x)$ of ϵ_1 has at least one root ξ_1 with $|\xi_1| \neq 1$.

The Galois group G of $A(x)$ acts transitively on the roots of $A_1(x)$, hence there is a $\sigma \in G$ such that $\sigma(\epsilon_1) = \xi_1$. Define $\xi_i = \sigma(\epsilon_i)$, $\xi_{ij} := \xi_i/\xi_j = \sigma(\epsilon_{ij})$, then $\xi_j, j \neq 0$, and $\xi_{jk}, j \neq k$, are roots of $A(x)$. Let

$$I = \{i : \ 1 \leq i \leq N-1, \ |\xi_i| = 1\}, \ k = \#I,$$

and let $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ be the distinct values of $|\xi_i|$ different from 1. Since $|\xi_1| \neq 1$, we have $m \geq 1$.

For each value of r_i, fix a root ξ_j with $|\xi_j| = r_i$, and consider the roots

$$\xi_{jj'} : \ j' \in I. \tag{4.3}$$

This yields k distinct roots of modulus r_i. The total number of roots (4.3), for all r_i, is mk.

We now consider two cases.

- If all r_i are > 1, consider the roots

  $$1/\xi_i : \ i \neq 0, i \notin I,$$

  which have modulus < 1 and are therefore distinct from the roots found in (4.3). The number of such roots is $N - 1 - k$. Hence the total number of roots of modulus $\neq 1$ is at least $mk + (N-1-k) = N - 1 + (m-1)k \geq N - 1$. The case when all r_i are < 1 is similar.

- Suppose now that $r_2 = \min(r_i) < 1$, $r_3 = \max(r_i) > 1$, and fix ξ_2, ξ_3 such that $|\xi_2| = r_2$, $|\xi_3| = r_3$. Consider the roots

  $$\{\xi_{2j} : \ |\xi_j| > 1\} \cup \{\xi_{3j} : \ |\xi_j| < 1\}. \tag{4.4}$$

  The roots (4.4) have modulus either $< r_2$ or $> r_3$, hence are distinct from those in (4.3). The number of roots in (4.4) is $N-1-k$, so that again we have at least $mk + (N-1-k) \geq N - 1$ roots of modulus $\neq 1$. ■

5 Miscellaneous

Proof of Proposition 1.10. We begin with (i). Suppose that $A(x)$ is irreducible, and that A tiles $\mathbf{Z}$. Then there are $B \subset \mathbf{Z}$, $m \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $A(x)B(x) = P_m(x) (\bmod x^m - 1)$, where $B(x) = \sum_{b \in B} x^b$ and $P_m(x) = 1 + x + \ldots + x^{m-1}$ (see [1], Lemma 1.3). Since $A(x)$ is irreducible, either $A(x)$ divides $P_m(x)$ or $P_m(x)$ divides $B(x)$. But in the latter case $m = P_m(1) = A(1)B(1)$ divides $B(1)$, hence $N = A(1) = 1$ and $A = \{0\}$. Therefore we must have $A(x) | P_m(x)$, *i.e.*, $A(x) = \Phi_k(x)$ for some $k|m$. By Theorem 1.4,

$$N = A(1) = \prod_{s \in S_A} \Phi_s(1) = \Phi_k(1).$$

SInce $N \neq 1$, it follows from (2.1) that N is prime and $k = N^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}$. Then

$$A(x) = 1 + x^\alpha + x^{2\alpha} + \ldots + x^{(n-1)\alpha},$$

(cf. [1], Lemma 1.1), and it is trivial to verify that $\{0, \frac{1}{N^\alpha}, \frac{2}{N^\alpha}, \ldots, \frac{N-1}{N^\alpha}\}$ is a spectrum for $A(x)$.

It remains to prove (ii). Suppose that $A(\epsilon) = 0$ for at least one root of unity ϵ. Since A is irreducible, $A(x) = \Phi_s(x)$ for some s; using (2.1) as above, we find that $N = A(1)$ is prime and hence the conclusions of (i) hold. In particular, $A = \{0, \alpha, 2\alpha, \ldots, (N-1)\alpha\}$ tiles $\mathbf{Z}$.

Assume therefore that $A(x)$ has a spectrum $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{N-1}\}$, and that θ_1 is irrational. We shall first prove that $A(x)$ must have at least N roots off the circle $|x| = 1$; combining this with Lemma 3.1, we find that

$$\deg(A(x)) \geq \frac{5N}{2} - 1. \tag{5.1}$$

Let $\epsilon_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_j}$. Then ϵ_j and $\epsilon_{jk} := \epsilon_j / \epsilon_k$, $j \neq k$, are roots of $A(x)$, and ϵ_1 is not a root of unity. By Kronecker's theorem [14], $A(x)$ has at least one root ξ with $|\xi| \neq 1$. Also, $\bar{\epsilon}_1$ is a root of $A_1(x)$, hence by elementary Galois theory so is $1/\xi$. Thus $A(x)$ has at least one root of modulus > 1.

Let ξ_1 be a root of $A(x)$ of maximal modulus; from the previous paragraph we have $|\xi_1| > 1$. Since $A(x)$ is irreducible, its Galois group G is transitive, hence there is a $\sigma \in G$ such that $\sigma(\epsilon_1) = \xi_1$. Define $\xi_i = \sigma(\epsilon_i)$, then ξ_i and $\xi_{ij} := \xi_i / \xi_j = \sigma(\epsilon_{ij})$ are roots of $A(x)$. Consider the sequence of roots:

$$\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \ldots, \xi_{N-1}, \xi_{12}, \xi_{13}, \ldots, \xi_{1,N-1}. \tag{5.2}$$

Let $j \geq 2$. By the maximality of $|\xi_1|$, we have $|\xi_j| \leq |\xi_1|$ and $|\xi_{ij}| = |\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_j}| \leq |\xi_1|$, hence:

$$1 \leq |\xi_j| \leq |\xi_1|.$$

Moreover, since $|\xi_1| \neq 1$, at most one of ξ_j, ξ_{1j} has modulus 1. Hence the sequence

$$\xi_2, \xi_3, \ldots, \xi_{N-1}, \xi_{12}, \xi_{13}, \ldots, \xi_{1,N-1}.$$

contains at least $N-2$ entries with modulus > 1. Since the ξ_i are distinct and $\neq 1$ for $i \neq 0$, the value ξ_1 appears only once in (5.2), and any other value is taken at most twice (once as ξ_j and once as $\xi_{1j'}$). Hence (5.2) contains at least $1 + (N-2)/2 = N/2$ distinct roots of modulus

> 1. Similarly, using $1/\xi_1$ instead of ξ_1, we may find at least $N/2$ distinct roots of modulus < 1. This proves the claim that $A(x)$ has at least N roots off the unit circle.

Finally, we improve (5.1) to

$$\deg\left(A(x)\right) \geq \frac{5N}{2}.$$

Observe that this improvement is automatic if N is odd, since then $N/2$ is not an integer and the above construction yields $\frac{N+1}{2} + \frac{N+1}{2} = N + 1$ roots of modulus $\neq 1$. Assume therefore that N is even, and denote $|\xi_1| = R$. From the above construction, $\deg(A(x))$ may equal $\frac{5N}{2} - 1$ only if the following hold:

(1) For any $2 \leq i \leq N - 1$, only one of ξ_i, ξ_{1i} has modulus $\neq 1$. Hence $|\xi_i| = 1$ or R.

(2) For any $2 \leq i \leq N - 1$ there is a $2 \leq j \leq N - 1$ such that $\xi_1 = \xi_{1j}$. Since ξ_i are distinct, this is a 1-1 correspondence; moreover, (1) above implies that $i \neq j$.

(3) There are no roots of $A(x)$ of modulus R other than those ξ_i with $|\xi_i| = R$.

By (1), (2), we must have $\{1, 2, \ldots, N - 1\} = I_1 \cup I_2$, where $I_1 = \{i : \ |\xi_i| = R\}$, $I_2 = \{i : |\xi_i| = 1\}$, $1 \in I_1$, $\#I_1 = N/2$, $\#I_2 = \frac{N}{2} - 1$. Let $i \in I_1$, $j \in I_2$, then $|\xi_{ij}| = \frac{|\xi_i|}{|\xi_j|} = R$, hence by (3) there is a $k = k(i, j) \in I_1$ such that $\xi_{ij} = \xi_k$. Note that for any fixed j the mapping $i \rightarrow k(i, j)$ is one-to-one, and therefore may be inverted. Thus, if $j \in I_2$ is fixed, for any $k \in I_1$ there is a $i \in I_1$ such that $\xi_{ij} = \xi_k$, or, equivalently, $\xi_k \xi_j = \xi_i$. Iterating this procedure, we find that for any $j \in I_2$ and $k \in I_1$:

$$\xi_k,\ \xi_k\xi_j,\ \xi_k\xi_j^2, \ldots, \xi_k\xi_j^n, \ldots \in \{\xi_i :\ i \in I_1\}.$$

But $\#I_1 = N/2$, hence $\xi_j^s = 1$ for some $s \leq N/2$. Since $A(x)$ is irreducible, we must have $A(x) = \Phi_s(x)$ for some $s \leq N/2$, which clearly contradicts our assumptions. ■

Proof of Corollary 1.7. Let $A = \{0, a_1, a_2\}$. We may assume that $(a_1, a_2) = 1$: indeed, let $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, then A tiles $\mathbf{Z}$ if and only if kA tiles $\mathbf{Z}$ ([1], Lemma 1.4(1)), and $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$ is a spectrum for $A(x)$ if and only if $\{\theta_1/k, \theta_2/k\}$ is a spectrum for $(kA)(x) = A(x^k)$.

If A tiles $\mathbf{Z}$, $A(x)$ has a spectrum by Corollary 1.6(i). Conversely, suppose that $A(x)$ has a spectrum $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, then:

$$1 + e^{2\pi i a_1 \theta_j} + e^{2\pi i a_2 \theta_j} = 0,\ j = 1, 2.$$

Hence $e^{2\pi i a_1 \theta_j}$, $e^{2\pi i a_2 \theta_j}$ are cubic roots of 1, and in particular $a_1\theta_j, a_2\theta_j \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{Z}$. Since $(a_1, a_2) = 1$, there are integers k_1, k_2 such that $k_1 a_1 + k_2 a_2 = 1$, so that

$$\theta_j = k_1 a_1 \theta_j + k_2 a_2 \theta_j \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{Z}.$$

By Corollary 1.6(ii), A tiles $\mathbf{Z}$. ■

References

[1] E. M. Coven, A. Meyerowitz: *Tiling the integers with translates of one finite set*, J. Algebra **212** (1999), 161–174.

[2] B. Fuglede: *Commuting self-adjoint partial differential operators and a group theoretic problem*, J. Funct. Anal. **16** (1974), 101–121.

[3] A. Iosevich, N. H. Katz, S. Pedersen: *Fourier bases and a distance problem of Erdös*, Math. Res. Lett. **6** (1999), 251–255.

[4] A. Iosevich, N. H. Katz, T. Tao: *Convex bodies with a point of curvature do not have Fourier bases*, Amer. J. Math, to appear.

[5] A. Iosevich, N. H. Katz, T. Tao: preprint in preparation.

[6] A. Iosevich, S. Pedersen: *Spectral and tiling properties of the unit cube*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **16** (1998), 819–828.

[7] P. Jorgensen: *Spectral theory of finite volume domains in* $\mathbf{R}^n$, Adv. Math. **44** (1982), 105–120.

[8] P. Jorgensen, S. Pedersen: *Spectral theory for Borel sets in* $\mathbf{R}^n$ *of finite measure*, J. Funct. Anal. **107** (1992), 72–104.

[9] P. Jorgensen, S. Pedersen: *Harmonic analysis and fractal limit-measures induced by representations of certain* C^**-algebra*, J. Funct. Anal. **125** (1994), 90–110.

[10] P. Jorgensen, S. Pedersen: *Fractal Geometry and Stochastics*, in: Progress in Probability, vol.17, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, 191–219.

[11] P. Jorgensen, S. Pedersen: *Spectral pairs in Cartesian coordinates*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **5** (1999), 285–302.

[12] M. Kolountzakis: *Non-symmetric convex domains have no basis of exponentials*, Illinois J. Math., to appear.

[13] M. Kolountzakis: *Packing, tiling, orthogonality, and completeness*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **32** (2000), 589–599.

[14] L. Kronecker: *Zwei Sätze über Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Coefficienten*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **53** (1857), 173–175.

[15] I. Łaba: *Fuglede's conjecture for a union of two intervals*, Proc. AMS, to appear.

[16] J. C. Lagarias, J. A. Reed, Y. Wang: *Orthonormal bases of exponentials for the n-cube*, Duke Math. J. **103** (2000), 25–37.

[17] J. C. Lagarias, S. Szabó: *Universal spectra and Tijdeman's conjecture on factorization of cyclic groups*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl., to appear.

[18] J. C. Lagarias, Y. Wang: *Tiling the line with translates of one tile*, Invent. Math. **124** (1996), 341–365.

[19] J. C. Lagarias, Y. Wang: *Spectral sets and factorizations of finite abelian groups*, J. Funct. Anal. **145** (1997), 73–98.

[20] D. J. Newman: *Tesselation of integers*, J. Number Theory **9** (1977), 107–111.

[21] S. Pedersen: *Spectral theory of commuting self-adjoint partial differential operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **73** (1987), 122–134.

[22] S. Pedersen: *Spectral sets whose spectrum is a lattice with a base*, J. Funct. Anal. **141** (1996), 496–509.

[23] S. Pedersen, Y. Wang: *Universal spectra, universal tiling sets and the spectral set conjecture*, Math. Scand., to appear.

[24] S. Szabó: *A type of factorization of finite abelian groups*, Discrete Math. **54** (1985), 121–124.